

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 20, and 21 are in the application, with claims 1, 5, 8, 14 - 16, 20 and 21 having been amended. Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for their discussion on October 22, 2007. No agreement was reached.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,516,421 ("Peters"). Claims 5, 15, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,536 ("Park"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20

Amended independent claim 1 discloses a method that comprises establishing a first power policy associated with a system that places the system in a low- power state after a first pre-determined period of time, receiving from a user an affirmative indication that the user is no longer using the system, and in response to the indication, establishing a second power policy associated with the system that places the system in the low-power state after a second pre-determined period of time. The second pre-determined time is less than the first pre-determined time. Moreover, the indication is sent via a connection with the display unit.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an indication that the user is no longer using a system, wherein the indication is sent via a connection with a display unit.

The Office Action states that in Peters a logoff or shutdown indication is received after a user selects logoff or shutdown by pressing a mouse or a key on a keyboard. The indication, suggested by the Office Action, is therefore sent via a connection with the mouse or a connection with the keyboard (in response to pressing the mouse or keyboard). Accordingly, nowhere can Peters be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an indication that the user is no longer using a system, wherein the indication is sent via a connection with a display unit.

The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies in Peters. Therefore, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an indication that the user is no longer using a system, wherein the indication is sent via a connection with a display unit.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 each disclose similar limitations. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 and their related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 5

Dependent claim 5 discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the indication comprises physically turning off a display unit by pressing a button on the display unit.

The Office Action concedes that Peters does not teach an indication that comprises turning off the display unit.

Park discloses a flat screen that comprises a sensing device to detect if a user is within a predetermined sensing range. The sensing device reflects an ultrasonic wave off of the user and if the ultrasonic wave is not received, the computer system instantly goes into a power saving function where the power saving function cuts off power directed to a back-light unit of the LCD display panel. Park therefore shuts down the LCD in response to an indication that an ultrasonic wave was not received. However, nowhere can Park be seen to disclose or suggest that the user turns off the LCD display panel by pressing a button on the display unit.

Therefore, nowhere does the combination of Peters and Park, taken in any permissible combination, disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the indication comprises physically turning off a display unit by pressing a button on the display unit.

In view of the foregoing, amended dependent claim 5 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

October 24, 2007
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982